Blood Atonement.

More of It in Proof.

EDS. TRIBUNE:—The article in your supplement of Sunday last, on Blood Atonement, by Historicus, in reply to Chas. W. Penrose on that horrid Mormon doctrine, was read with special interest by the thousands of your readers It is telling and unanswerable, and should have a wide-spread and continuous circulation. Its theological points are well taken, and the presumptuous dogmatis s of Mormonism totally overthrown; and the illustrations given seem incontrovertible. We are all grateful for the article.

There is, however,

ANOTHER CLASS OF BLOOD ATONING,

which your correspondent either overlooked, or refrained from giving through motives of delicacy To make the working of the unholy and cruel doctrine complete, he should have it made public also, which, with your permission I will do.

To further elucidate that blood atonement was practiced as much as the Church members dare do in the spirit of their horrid "reformation," I ask, dares Penrose deny that young Jones of the First Ward in this city was cruelly castrated for alleged carnal intercourse, but which was never proved against him? Would he deny that the cruel priestly executors exposed on the gate what they cut from the young fellow, to the gaze of the public? Would he deny that the young woman who was implicated with him, even after the wicked maiming, besought, with many tears and stifling sobs, Brigham Young's consent to their marriage, the poor fellow, even then, having fled to the canyon in his dreadful condition, to save further attack on him to take his life? These are indisputable facts. But further: Will the elder deny that the same young man and his mhoter, an old woman, were both

KILLED IN A DUGOUT

in Payson during the move South and buried there by pulling the roof over them, for an alleged crime? It is said by Mormons that they committed incest and that was the cause, but nothing was ever proven of the kind. Even if they were guilty—the deaths are not denied—were they not blood-a-toned, without waiting till the proper time arrived? The real truth is, the cruel elders implicated in the deed were afraid that the matter would be brought up before the United States courts, and to prevent the results to themselves and the wicked Church, the unhappy pair were killed and buried as stated.

Dares he deny that young Lewis (that is the name, I think) was castrated by order of Bishop Warren S. Snow, presiding bishop of San Pete county? The young man was not even charged with crime or sin, but had an altercation with the Melchisedek bishop about a young lady, the affianced of the man, whom the bishop coveted, though having at the same time other women as wives. While the young man was suffering with the cruel treatment Joseph Young, Brigham's brother, a man of human feelings, being in that vicinity, offered to "administer," to him to heal him by laying on of hands He scornfully refused to allow the blasphemous "ordinance," adding, "what good can you do me? You can not restore my manhood." The young man afterwards was

LOST OR DONE AWAY WITH.

Can he deny these facts of bloody work? Bishop W. S Snow was sent afterwards on a mission to England to bring other victims to enjoy the safety of Zion, and the blessings of such a cursing religion. Can he deny that a man, who still lives in Nephi, was castrated by a jealous and unjust husband, during the times of the "Reformation" acting under the teachings of Mormon blood-atonement? That husband, without proper cause, suspected his victim of improper intimacy with his wife; and with a posse of elders seized the innocent man, telling him he could either choose death or castration. The man strongly denied the charge, supported by the word of the woman, who to her death, and on her dying bed protested their innocence. But the pious blood-atoner was inexorable. The victim while declaring his innocence said, "I do not want to die, and will therefore prefer the castration." He chose

THE LEAST OF TWO EVILS,

and was cruelly maimed. That husband departed from Utah when Johnson's army entered this valley and has never returned He dreaded the consequence of his rash act, although perpetrated in the spirit of the blood-atonement of the Mormon Church. an Brother Penrose have the face to deny that fact? Can he also deny that the Mormon authorities married that same unfortunate man to a young girl afterwards? That she after several months left him, and he was married to another young English girl, by Mormon authority, with whom he yet lives? Dares Penrose deny that this same bloody spirit of Mormon atonement was applied to a young man at Ogden, about the time that the United States Army entered this valley? During the time of the young man's illness, caused by the cruel act, he was under strict guard furnished and paid by the authorities of the Mormon Church. The Church knew of the vicious deed, but was not only silent about it, but did what they could to conceal it I do not say that Brigham Young ordered the maiming, but it was done by the elders, actuated to the full by the spirit of the times, and in the prosecution of what they thought was their duty, instigated by the doctrines of the Church as taught in Brigham's, Heber's and Jeddy's dreadful sermons. Do not these prove that the time had come to many in which the hands of a blood thirsty church executed its diabolical practices. It would do the same to-day if it dared, were it not for the presence of the United States Army and heroic United States officials, and brave American citizens.

May I also add

ONE MORE MURDER

to the list of Historicus? In Kaysville, Davis County, a pretty good kind of a man otherwise, wanted a girl there for a second wife, and ingratiated himself so far into her affections as to gain her consent; but that couple did not wait for the marriage feast until the marriage day, He was suspected and confessed, and proffered at once to marry the girl. The male friends of the girl refused him the "privilege," though it was always common and customary in all other cases to do so, and the man was blood-atoned. Dares Mr. Penrose, the gigantic denier, deny it? The writer can give the name of the woman, and the man who married her afterwards.

Is it not a horrid system under the name of a religion that can be guilty of such abominable practices, and have men acknowledge that it is a correct doctrine which will yet be applied to its frail members, numerous as they are, as does High Priest C. W. Penrose acknowledge in his discourse on Blood Atonement? OLD RESIDENTER.

SALT LAKE CITY, Oct. 30, 1884.

UPB